MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY
University Academic Senate Minutes
September 20, 2021
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Teams

Members in attendance: Dr. Allison Abbott, Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Ms. Valerie Beech, Dr. Jill Birren, Ms. Rebecca Blemberg, Dr. Heidi Bostic, Ms. Jennifer Cook, Dr. Joseph Domblesky, Dr. Michael Donoghue, Dr. Scott D’Urso, Mr. Atiba Ellis, Dr. Sarah Feldner, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Paul Gasser, Dr. Sarah Gendron, Dr. Arndt Guentsch, Ms. Makayla Harrow, Mr. Tim Houge, Dr. Margaret Hughes-Morgan, Dr. Yasser Khaled, Dr. Chima Korieh, Dr. Jennifer Ohlendorf, Dr. Lars Olson, Ms. Samari Price, Ms. Taylor Ralph, Dr. Kristina Ropella, Mr. Doug Smith, Dr. Elaine Spiller, Dr. Christopher Stockdale, Dr. John Su, Mr. A. Jay Wagner, Dr. Doris Walker-Dalhouse, Dr. Miao (Grace) Wang, Dr. David Wangrow, Dr. Amber Wichowsky, Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller, Dr. Doug Woods

Members excused: Mrs. Lisa Weber

Guests: see spreadsheet for full attendance list

I. The Chair observed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Michael Donoghue; he includes a moment of silence to pray for President Lovell’s health.

III. Approval of August 30, 2021 meeting minutes (Att. III)
   - Motion to approve: Senator Jennifer Ohlendorf
   - Second: Senator Marilyn Frenn
   - Passed without objection

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Allison Abbott
   - Reminder that the agenda along with attached documents are sent out the week prior to the meeting. Please scroll through the entire email to find these items. They are also available on the UAS Teams site.
   - Chair advises that she has received feedback that there is a desire for more time to review the agenda and documents prior to the Senate meetings. The UAS Executive Committee meets the Monday prior to the full meeting. She will see if the committee can provide more time for review of meeting materials. There is no stipulated timeframe in Senate bylaws or Robert’s Rules, but the concerns are taken seriously. A reminder that any senator can make a motion to postpone a vote if they do not feel they have had ample time to review and/or vet the material.
   - Chair states that she has sent along documents related to the independent budget analysis and informs interested parties to get additional information from the Marquette chapter of AAUP.
   - There were calls at the last meeting for two faculty volunteers. Dr. Chris Stockdale will be UAS representative for Cyber Security Committee. Dr. Stephen Beall will serve on Academic Program Review Council.
   - We have three searches going on right now, and we are looking for nominations for the search committees. Faculty serving on these committees do not have to be senators. The survey for this is posted in the chat.
   - The UAS Executive Committee has been working on the proposal for the UAS sub-committee for budgets and financial planning. The track changes file is in the chat. Chair thanks everyone who has provided feedback.

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Dr. Amber Wichowsky
   - Faculty Council’s first meeting included a brief review of FC’s role and soliciting a vice chair for FC. They discussed proposal for the standing budget committee. FC is seeking nominations for faculty to serve on the MCC advisory council; meetings are once per semester. FC appoints six of the faculty who serve on committee. Please email Chair Dr. Jeff Berry with nominations.

VI. Secretary’s Report – Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
   - We are joined by new senator Dr. Jill Birren representing the College of Education. Welcome to Jill.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Provost
• Enrollment: Census Day is drawing closer for UG enrollment. We expect to land around 1660 first-year students. This is below the budget target of 1770. Grad/Professional enrollment is the highest it’s been in about a decade. Enrollment is up 19% over last year’s incoming class. This helps to close some of the budget gap but does not eliminate it completely. Incoming class is the most diverse in Marquette’s history – 34% of first-year are non-White. First-year class is ~6% African American (last year’s class was ~3%). 18% of students are Latinx. We hope to achieve the emerging HSI status of 15% of entire population. Finally, 24% of incoming class are first generation students.

• USN&WR ranking: We are ranked 83 nationally, up from 88 last year. We rank 58 in best UG teaching; this is down from last year. Program highlights: Nursing is 43; Accounting is 21; Finance is 22 and Supply Chain is 16.

• Search updates: The three searches include dean of nursing, VP of inclusive excellence, and dean of libraries. Dr. Lisa Hanson will chair the nursing search. I have met with the relevant groups for VP of inclusive excellence. Dr. Chris Stockdale (UBUS representative) – this is not blanket approval that we would give credit, but this would allow each department to consider it.

• Big East Exchange: proposal was forwarded to Senate Chair. This is an opportunity to look at exchange within Big East to allow students to go to another college campus for a year or a semester. Unsure which Big East schools will participate but it is likely not all. The provost is interested in entertaining this for Marquette. This would operate much like the study abroad program.

o Discussion/Questions:

• Q: Chat – Are you concerned at all about the significant change in the UG teaching ranking?
  • A: Provost Ah Yun – I always would like us to be ranked more highly. This is a ranking that has changed. Two years ago we were 76, last year we were 18. Because this is about reputation (peer-rankings), we need to consider what we can do improve and protect our reputation. We had some publicity that went out in Inside Higher Education and the Chronicle of Higher Education that identified some challenges that I believe were not fully vetted. This does not help our reputation.

• Q: Chat – What is the timeframe for the development of the FY 23 budget? Is the plan to present it to the BOT in December?
  • A: Provost Ah Yun – We always start in the summer, and we do have a UAS-recommended faculty member on UFPRC. The intention is to report to the BOT in December as we do every year.
  • A: Chair – We will have Alix Riley present teaching loads, class sizes and other data in the next meeting. We can see what has changed from last year to this year. We can also get data from the co-chairs of last year’s Teaching work group.
  • A: Provost Ah Yun – There were questions about how class sizes and teaching loads would be affected. Alix can answer some of these questions after Census Day.

VIII. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

o Motion to approve: Modification to the undergraduate bulletin, section on advanced standing credit: allow awarding of credit for DANTES Subject Standardized Tests (DSST) (Att. VIII)

Dr. John Su:

o Proposal to modify UG bulletin: this is the section that refers to the advanced standing. This would allow the normal transfer evaluation process to occur for students who would take the exams. It is similar to other examinations that demonstrate prior learning. This would allow the normal transfer evaluation process to occur for students who would take such exams. The reason to do this is to follow a transfer-friendly principle. Should this be passed, it would be sent out through the normal process for the departments and relevant subject areas to evaluate whether or not credit would be offered. There was unanimous approval from the UBUS committee to allow faculty to evaluate these.

o Dr. Chris Stockdale (UBUS representative) – this is not blanket approval that we would give credit, but this would allow each department to consider it.

o Motion to approve is not required since the motion comes from a standing committee.

o Passed without objection or abstention.
IX. University Budget and Financial Planning Committee Proposal – Dr. Allison Abbott and Dr. Jeffrey Berry, Chair of Faculty Council

- **Motion to approve**: Proposal for new University Committee on Budget and Financial Planning reporting to University Academic Senate (Att. IX)

Dr. Allison Abbott:

- Chair thanks Senator Wichowsky and Dr. Jeff Berry for their contributions. She also thanks the provost and SVP/COO for their contributions. Leadership has expressed support throughout the entire process and worked with executive committee members to find ways to make this work. This will be a work in progress, and we can keep working to optimize this in the upcoming years. The spirit of the conversation was to create a system where the committee can do the work it needs to, but also balance the sensitivity of some of the information that would be shared.

- Senate Chair reviews the process which ultimately requires 2/3 support from the Senate because it relates to Senate by-laws. Then it would need to be approved by the provost and moved onto the president for his approval.

- The name was changed to University Faculty Committee on Budgets and Financial Planning. Structure was added to provide a direct line of communication for recommendations and feedback to/from UFPRC.

- Faculty representation can be any faculty member, regardless of status. We added a senate liaison, and we also codified the process for faculty representative recommendations. We will nominate three faculty members and a representative will be selected from those selected nominations and appointed by the provost.

- The last piece deals with the confidentiality concerns. We made some changes to item #5 (operations), limiting overreach on either side, and offering an opportunity for members of the committee to request that UAS go into executive session. Number 7 is an addition that pertains to any presentation to the full UAS regarding the budgeting process. The chair of the Committee will receive approval from the VP of Finance to ensure protection of sensitive information. Presentations pertaining solely to Academic Affairs would not require approval.

- Motion to approve the proposal for new University Committee on Budget and Financial Planning: Senate Chair

- Second: Senator Gendron

- Open for discussion/debate

Discussion/Questions:

- **Q**: Senator Frenn – The chair of this committee will attend all UAS meetings (reference line 78, page 2)? Or just one? And we are electing someone who will be a liaison? Will we have two liaisons?
  - **A**:
    - Chair – This individual is both a chair and a liaison. The chair will attend all UAS meetings; this is much like Faculty Council’s presence at UAS meetings. There is redundency in the system, but feel free to propose amendments if you feel there are reasons to change that.
  - **Q**: Frenn – Thank you for clarifying that. I think it would be a lot of work for this individual. Are they a voting member or do they just attend the meetings?
    - **Chair** – Yes, this role is just like Dr. Berry’s; he is the chair/liaison for FC. In his role he attends the UAS meetings but is not a senator.

- **Q**: Senator Smith expresses his appreciation for all who have been involved in this effort. This is a unique opportunity for us to be certain that UAS has meaningful input into the budget and financial priorities. Kimo, do you endorse the proposal as it is currently written?
  - **A**:
    - Provost Ah Yun asks the Chair to verify that nothing has changed since their last meeting (she advises nothing has changed). The provost advises that he endorses and is in support of this; the COO is also aligned. This is something we have worked closely on with Allison, Jeff, and Amber.

- **Q**: Senator Houge – I don’t disapprove of the council as a whole, but it seems to me that students have been forgotten in this. This is just a mechanism for faculty to have a greater voice but not students. I plan to reach out to the GSO and MUSG to try to get a student version of this proposal planned. I expect that I am not the only student who feels this is relevant to our future. We should center students in these decision-making processes.
  - **A**:
    - Chair – I am glad to hear you express your concerns and interest in this. I do agree with you. We have talked about this, and there were questions about how we align and work with those groups. We are just trying to carve out a smaller piece right now. I think having a representative from GSO and MUSG would be important. The subcommittees do vary – some have student representatives, and some do not. It just depends on the mission of the committees.

- **Q**: Frenn – will the UAS-elected liaison be a voting member of the new committee? I cannot find it in the statutes.
and bylaws if liaisons of other committees vote. We should clarify that.

- **A:** Chair – I believe I was a voting member as a Senate liaison to UBUS. If it is not stipulated, there is precedence for liaisons being voting representatives. Chair asks Dr. John Su if he can advise.
- **A:** Dr. Su – Traditionally in academic shared governance, standing committees student representatives are voting representative unless otherwise stipulated.
- **Q:** Chair – And the liaisons as well?
- **A:** Dr. Su – Yes.
- **A:** Vice Chair Wichowsky – The liaison for Faculty Council is not a voting representative.
- **A:** Chair – There was a question about that.
- **A:** Dr. Berry – There is nothing prohibiting you from voting. The issue last year was the interpretation of the term ex officio, which some people say implies non-voting status. This is not true; it just means you are part of our committee because of your assignment on a different one.
- **Q:** Chair to Senator Frenn – If there is precedence in norms for other committees, do you think we need to make changes in this document?
- **A:** Senator Frenn – It probably should be addressed in the bylaws or statutes because it seems rather unclear. It is the job of FC to look at the state of shared governance, so maybe they can look at all of these documents? It should probably be the same thing overall – either the UAS liaison has a vote or they do not.
- **A:** Chair – It is important to be as clear as we can. I am trying to sort out the procedure if we want to make an amendment.
- **A:** Vice Chair Wichowsky – I like the suggestion to have FC review. I believe that this is on FC’s agenda for this year to review the entire handbook.

- **Q:** Gary Adams – This is a great document. Kudos to everyone. The faculty, through the provost, are responsible for the academic curriculum and programs. In paragraph two, line 27, I see a very broad overview of some financial documents. I find that this is good information, but I wonder if it is helpful to have particular information, specific to revenues and expenses for programs and initiatives? Some of this information comes from UBUS and UBGS when new programs are being proposed, etc.; however, I am not certain there is always a strong connection there. When we have a new initiative, there is a budget request that accompanies that etc.; however, I am not certain there is always a strong connection there. When we have a new initiative, there is a budget request that accompanies that. Does that come before UAS and would it be this committee that would take a closer look at it? I wonder if there is more programmatic detail that can be added rather than the high overview?

- **A:** Chair – That financial piece is not necessarily true on the UG level, but more so with the graduate level as programs go through their approval process. That goes through more of the programmatic pipeline that is already existing (via UBGS) rather than Senate.
- **A:** Vice Chair – The clause states, “may include, but is not limited to….”. To your point about budgeting as it relates to programming, there were recommendations from the work groups last year that the provost is currently sorting through. There may be things within these recommendations that can be shared with this committee as well. I think this clause is written in a way that is inclusive of sharing such information.

- **Q:** Senator Smith – Certainly you, as the Chair, and the Secretary are in a position to interpret this and decide who is entitled to a vote and who is not. If FC does not think that is appropriate, then they can move forward with an amendment at some point. Worrying about a single vote is not as important as creating the committee and getting committee members appointed.

- **Comment:** Senator Feldner – I have been on UBUS. When a new program comes through, there is budget information available. We need to be careful about setting up a situation in which committees are stepping on each other’s toes. The board of UBUS looks at the budget information as part of the equation.

- **A:** Chair – This committee would not be part of the program approval pipeline for either UBGS or UBUS.
- **Comment:** Dr. Petrites via chat – there is a graduate and undergraduate student representative on the UFPRC.
- **Q:** Senator Spiller – Are there examples of sensitive materials (reference #5 under operations). It is just a little vague about what would be considered confidential or sensitive.

- **A:** Chair – Sensitive or confidential information would pertain to individual faculty/staff salaries, enrollment strategies, or something that puts us at a competitive disadvantage if the information is shared publicly. There is also time-sensitive information; for example, there is information that gets presented to the BOT before it is made public. We will need to work together in good faith to determine this at times.
• Provost – Yes, I agree with your examples. We do not want to disclose information that would give a competitive advantage to other universities. We want to be mindful about protecting this information.
• Comment: Vice Chair Wichowsky – If the committee had a specific data request, that would be visible and transparent to UAS. The points that Kimo and Allison raise seem like reasonable ones, but I see nothing that would preclude the committee from saying, “This is the information that we have requested.”

○ Vote to approve the motion for new University Committee on Budget and Financial Planning
○ Passed with 2/3+ support; this will move onto the provost and the president
○ Chair advises that there was a request to create an interim task force. It is within the powers of UAS to create an interim task force if that is seen as necessary before the committee is operational.

X. Proposed Resolution on Faculty Participation in Task Forces, Working Groups, and other Governance Processes – Mr. Doug Smith, Senator

○ Motion to endorse: Resolution on Faculty Participation in Task Forces, Working Groups, and other Governance Processes (Att. X)

Mr. Doug Smith:

○ I did send an email to the senators with the changes that had been made to the resolution, based on the conversations that took place at the last meeting. The UAS should remain the centerpiece of meaningful shared governance at the university. The faculty who serve on these committees should be approved by the Senate (who was elected by the faculty). Secondly, I am concerned that some people may feel constrained about sharing key information about processes in which they are involved. The mechanism for dealing with concerns such as this is to bring these things to executive session. Then, at least, all of the senators who represent faculty are in a position to move forward. I hope the administration is willing to work with us moving forward. We do expect UAS will have a role in the appointment of faculty who are representing faculty interests in these types of committees. We can be trusted with the type of information that is necessary for us to have a meaningful role in shared governance.

○ Motion to endorse Resolution on Faculty Participation in Task Forces, Working Groups, and other Governance Processes; Senator Smith
○ Second: Senator Donoghue
○ Open the floor for discussion and debate

○ Discussion/Questions:
  • Comment: Senator Ropella motions to postpone the vote because the final revised version did not come out until Sunday afternoon and we have not had an opportunity to vet this with our college faculty. I still am not clear about all of the details of this and how it affects the individual colleges when we are appointing committees and taskforce work groups, etc.
    • A: Senator Smith – The scope of the resolution is now narrowed so it will not affect anything that is being done at the college level. Mr. Smith apologizes for the lateness of the updated resolution.

○ Motion to postpone the vote on the endorsement of the Resolution on Faculty Participation in Task Forces, Working Groups, and other Governance Processes to the October meeting; Senator Ropella
○ Second: Senator Frenn
○ Open the floor for discussion and debate

  • Comment: Senator Olson – I support the postponement of this vote. If we look back at the previous motion that was just approved, there was much input from FC and university leadership council. I don’t see that here. I don’t want to support a resolution that would have a committee step on another committee’s purview. Our senate needs input from the appropriate committees to support this motion. I think this proposal needs to be remanded in addition to it being postponed.
    • A: Chair – we might have to vote against the postponement and then take up a motion to refer/remand to another committee. I think Faculty Council would be that body because it is about shared governance.
  • Q: Senator Stockdale. If both parties who made the two motions are agreeable, they could withdraw their
motions and we could motion to refer.

- A: Senator Ropella is agreeable to withdrawing her motion to postpone and remand to FC.
- A: Senator Smith – I will not object to this going to Faculty Council for review and comment prior to full UAS consideration and vote.

- Motion to refer the Resolution on Faculty Participation in Task Forces, Working Groups, and other Governance Processes to Faculty Council for input from all relevant stakeholders that report to UAS: Senator Olson. [He also advises Senator Smith to consider other key stakeholders for feedback/input. If those committees would support the resolution, that would be important in weighing the endorsement of this by the senate body.]

- Second: Senator D’Urso

- Open the floor for discussion and debate

Discussion/Questions:

- Comment: Senator Woods – In general I support the motion but will abstain on principle of my position. I would encourage FC to consider our faculty bylaws, specifically the role that the executive committee plays as well as the chair in terms of when they can act on behalf of the entire UAS (Section 1.3). This is a good opportunity for senate to give itself guidance on when this is appropriate.

- Senator Frenn – I also concur with referring to FC, and I agree with Doug. There have been more situations within the last few years when the executive committee and/or the chair have seen it as appropriate to act on behalf of senate. We require any change to the statutes to come to the UAS for discussion, debate and a vote. Something like this needs to be vetted by quite a few groups who will likely have questions for Faculty Council. Therefore, I do believe this will require a few iterations.

- Vote to refer the resolution to Faculty Council

- Passed.

- UAS Chair will work with FC Chair on next steps.

XI. Proposed Resolution on Intellectual Property Rights of Faculty – Mr. Doug Smith, Senator

- Motion to endorse: Resolution on Intellectual Property Rights of Faculty (Att. XI)

Mr. Doug Smith:

- This is not the first time that UAS has discussed Intellectual Property Rights policy and the issues related to the appropriate surrender or transfer of intellectual property rights in relation to the creation of online courses. The purpose of my initial request to the Office of the Provost was simply to find out what the state of affairs is with respect to this. What rights are faculty being asked to surrender? The university is going to acquire pedagogical materials and use those to teach Marquette students but also presumably to teach students from other institutions. This is where the concern lies. I was told initially that I would receive that information; then I was told a week later that I would not. I am asking UAS to formally request this information from the provost.

Discussion/Questions:

- Comment: Provost Ah Yun – As we begin to approach this question, I would like to correct the record. An email was sent out by Senator Smith to the entire senate body talking about intellectual property resolution. [Provost Ah Yun reads the original email]. I was unaware of any request for IPP information, so I reached out to my team. No one recalled receiving a request for IPP information; therefore, I am uncertain that his office ever received the request. We have never had a problem with sharing documents, and I am not opposed to sharing this information. Finally, Doug Smith did reach out with an official request to my office regarding NTT contract templates. I ran it past UAS executives and told them that the request was made and I would need to run it through the process. I spoke with OGC and also thought about how these contracts contain sensitive information that faculty may or may not want released. I told the UAS chair that I would gladly discuss how the university establishes contracts and those related processes. I also pointed out that anyone could share their personal contract if willing. I can tell you there was an official request for the NTT contracts, but I can find no one in my office who believes they received a request for IPP.

- A: Senator Smith – I would be happy to forward the provost the email in which I was told that I would
receive the information. If you are comfortable releasing the information, why are we talking about this?

- **A:** Provost states that he did not receive the request. He advises that the first time he heard about this issue was on Sunday when Mr. Smith sent the email out.

- **Comment:** Senate Chair advises that this is all discussion prior to the motion. She asks if Senator Smith would like to put forth a motion.

- **Comment:** Senator Smith states that he will withdraw the motion. He states that he will send an email to the provost and copy the UAS Chair and Vice Chair, so they are aware that the request has been submitted.

- **A:** Provost Ah Yun – Given that we remanded the previous matter to FC, I believe that this similarly would need their involvement. I am happy to send to others as well, but if FC is where this is ultimately going to land, it makes sense to get them into the loop.

- **A:** Chair – I think if you share it with the UAS Executive Committee and with Doug, then it will go to FC as we have two reps for FC within this group. I think this brings up an important point that resolutions are clearly a very important part of our work. We can work together to figure out how we move toward resolutions. For example, there may be committee sub-structures that can assist prior to bringing these issues before the full senate. Voting on resolutions is an important part of our work, but we can work more collaboratively as we move forward.

- **Comment:** Dr. Berry – While FC does respond to charges and responses from the UAS, we can also respond from direct requests from faculty as well. That request can be placed in front of FC and if the majority of the group decides to take action on that item, we can do it. We do not need to have a charge from the senate in order to do that.

- **Comment:** Chair – That is a great point and a good example of how we can better utilize our existing structures.

---

**XII. Committee on Diversity and Equity Solicitation of Members, Update and AY2021-22 Goals – Ms. Kali Murray, Chair of Committee on Diversity and Equity**

Ms. Kali Murray:

- Thank you to the UAS for allowing me the opportunity to present. As I mentioned last May, any diversity policy should be: coherent, consistent, and committed. Right now the CDE is focused on finding a representative from A&S. Please email me if you are interested.

- I would like to thank Provost Ah Yun for working with us to assess and address pay equity issues at the university. We will also be working with him in the search for the VP of Inclusive Excellence. I think during this search, the candidates should be able to reflect on what we are doing well at the university as well as what we are not doing well. I think Marquette is doing fairly well in recruiting diverse students. I have three areas of concern regarding our diffuse efforts for getting diverse faculty. 1) I am concerned about retention of Faculty of Color. What are our efforts? I am excited to see the co-director of REIS; however, I am also concerned that we are not doing much to retain the faculty outside of the REIS. 2) I am concerned about the service load being put upon the Faculty of Color, females in particular. This remains a significant impediment to P&T. 3) I continue to be concerned with the climate of support for Faculty of Color regarding their efforts to participate within a range of activities. There is a burden of emotional stress that is not being measured significantly.

- The other major project – the committee itself may need to revisit its charge and its statutes. We may need to expand the membership of the committee and assess the work we have been given over time. Our committee was significantly overburdened last year. We will need to think about how to more effectively serve the campus community with limited resources.

- I will discuss with the UAS Chair how senate can better support faculty diversity at Marquette.

- **Discussion/Questions:**
  - **Comment:** Chair – We have lots of work to do, and we need a faculty member from A&S; this individual does not need to be a senator. Please help to identify someone for this committee.
    - **A:** Ms. Murray – I would take the names of interested individuals to the committee; we are having a meeting within the next couple of weeks and will make a selection then. This is a three-year term.
    - **Comment Chair** – As Kali pointed out, the same people keep getting asked to serve. Please consider other individuals as well.
  - **Q:** Valerie Beech chat – Can participating faculty serve on CDE?
    - **A:** Ms. Murray – Yes.
XIII. Adjourned at 4:44pm
   o Motion to adjourn: Senator Stockdale
   o Second: Senator Ropella
   o Passed without objection

Respectfully submitted,
Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, October 18, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. in Teams.